REMARKS

Receipt of the office action mailed March 28, 2007 is acknowledged. Claims 1-30 are pending in the application. Claims 1-30 are objected to for containing the words "vowelized" and "unvowelized." Claims 1, 11 and 21 are rejected as anticipated by the Debili reference. Claims 1-6, 9, 11-18 and 21-24 are rejected as anticipated by DeWick. Claims 7, 8, 10, 19, 20, and 25-30 are rejected as obvious over DeWick in view of Bennett. Claims 4, 13, 14, 23 and 24 are canceled and claims 31-35 are added. In keeping with the foregoing amendment and the following argument, reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

An aspect of the disclosed invention relates to a process for automatic vowelization of Arabic text. A non vowelled word (for example, the voweled word from the left side of Fig. 1c) is identified from a dictionary of non voweled words, and a group of voweled words (for example, a voweled word from the right side of Fig. 1c) corresponding to the identified non-voweled word issued by the first dictionary is extracted from a second dictionary. To implement the first step, the process compares a string of characters forming at least a current non-voweled word and a string of characters stored in a memory.

Based on the foregoing, and in response to the objection, Applicant has substituted the terms "voweled" and "non voweled" for the objected to language. The meaning of these terms new terms, as well as the original terms, should now be readily apparent from a reading of the specification. The objection is therefore overcome.

Claim 1 recites, in part, a process wherein a string of characters forming at least the current word is compared with strings of characters stored in the first memory area, so as to isolate at least one word from the first dictionary comprising the same character string as the current word.

By comparison, Debili et al. does not recite a step wherein a string of characters forming at least a current non vowelled word is compared to a string of characters stored in a memory so as to isolate/identify at least one word from the first dictionary. In other words, Debili et al. does not recite the step c/ of claim 1. Further, Debili et al. does not specify the way to select the non vowelled word in the first dictionary. Accordingly, claim 1 is not anticipated by Debili et al.

Independent claims 11 and 21 are not anticipated by Debili for the same reasons.

Claim 1 also recites a step wherein a string of characters forming at least a current non vowelled word is compared to a string of characters so as to isolate at least one word from the first dictionary. By comparison, DeWick does not disclose or even suggest this claim limitation.

De Wick et al. concerns a recording method of vocalized speech into shorthand notes and a transcribing method of shorthand notes into readable text. The shorthand words of the shorthand notes are used to locate match pairs of shorthand and conventional language words stored in at least one library thereby translating the shorthand words.

De Wick et al. does not recite a process for the vowelization of a text. De Wick et al. neither recites a first dictionary comprising non vowelled words nor recites a second dictionary working in correspondence with the first dictionary. In other words, steps a/ and b/ of claim 1 are not anticipated by De Wick et al. Accordingly, claim 1 defines over the reference.

The rejections of claim 1 based on Debili or De Wick are overcome, and claim 1 is in allowable form, as are the claims dependent upon claim 1. Claims 11 and 21 also are allowable form for the same reasons, as are their dependent claims.

New claim 31 recites a process for the vowelization of an Arabic language text aided by computer means and provides a first memory area in which a first dictionary comprising non vowelled words is stored, and a second memory area in which a second dictionary comprising groups of at least one vowelled word is stored, each group being stored in correspondence with an non vowelled word of said first dictionary. For a current non vowelled word, a string of characters forming at least said current word is compared with strings of characters stored in the first memory area, so as to isolate at least one word from the first dictionary comprising the same character string as the current word. The current word forms part of a succession of words, and a string of characters forming said succession of words comprising the current word is compared with strings of characters stored in a memory area in correspondence with the second memory area, so as to identify a plurality of words comprising one and the same string of characters as said succession of words. A group of vowelled candidate words corresponding to said isolated word from the first dictionary is extracted from the second dictionary and, for the current word, at least one vowelled word is

selected from said group of vowelled candidate words as a function of the succession of identified words and of a position of the current word in said succession of identified words.

By comparison, the invention of new claim 31 is not taught or even suggested by any of the cited references.

New claim 33 recites a computerized device for assisting the vowelization of an Arabic language text and comprising a first memory area in which a first dictionary comprising non vowelled words is stored, a second memory area in which a second dictionary comprising groups of at least one vowelled word is stored, each group being stored in correspondence with a non vowelled word of said first dictionary, and a memory area in which are stored instructions of a computer routine. The routine is suitable for comparing, for a current non vowelled word, a string of characters forming at least said current word with strings of characters stored in the first memory area, so as to isolate at least one word from the first dictionary comprising the same character string as the current word. The current word forms part of a succession of words, and the computer routine is devised so as to compare a string of characters forming said succession of words comprising the current word with strings of characters stored in a memory area in correspondence with the second memory area, so as to identify a plurality of words comprising one and the same string of characters as said succession of words, and extract a group of vowelled candidate words corresponding to said isolated word from the first dictionary from the second dictionary. For said current word, the routine selects at least one vowelled word from said group of vowelled candidate words as a function of the succession of identified words and of a position of the current word in said succession of identified words.

By comparison, the invention of new claim 33 is not taught or even suggested by any of the cited references.

New claim 34 recites a computer program for assisting the vowelization of an Arabic language text, stored in a memory of a computerized device or on a medium intended to cooperate with a reader of a computerized device, and comprising a first database devised according to a first dictionary comprising vowelled words, a second database devised according to a second dictionary comprising groups of at least one vowelled word, each group of the second base being indexed in correspondence with a non vowelled word of the

first base, and a computer routine. The routine is suitable for comparing, for a current non vowelled word, a string of characters forming at least one said current work with strings of characters stored in the first memory area, so as to isolate at least one word from the first dictionary comprising the same character string as the current word, and the current word forms part of a succession of words, and the program comprises instructions for comparing a string of characters forming said succession of words comprising the current word with strings of characters stored in a memory area in correspondence with the second memory area, so as to identify a plurality of words comprising one and the same string of characters as said succession of words, and extract a group of vowelled candidate words corresponding to said isolated words from the first dictionary from the second dictionary, and for said current word, selecting at least one vowelled word from said group of vowelled candidate words as a function of the succession of identified words and of a position of the current word in said succession of identified words.

By comparison, the invention of new claim 34 is not taught or even suggested by any of the cited references.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: September 27, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
David C. Read
Registration No.: 39,811
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300
Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300
Attorney for Applicant